

ҚАЗАҚСТАН РЕСПУБЛИКАСЫ
ҒЫЛЫМ ЖӘНЕ ЖОҒАРЫ БІЛІМ МИНИСТРАЛІГІ
ҒЫЛЫМ КОМИТЕТІ
Ш.Ш. УӘЛИХАНОВ АТЫНДАҒЫ ТАРИХ ЖӘНЕ ЭТНОЛОГИЯ ИНСТИТУТЫ



«EDU.E-HISTORY.KZ» ЭЛЕКТРОНДЫҚ ҒЫЛЫМИ ЖУРНАЛЫ



2024.11 (1)
қаңтар-наурыз

ISSN 2710-3994

ISSN 2710-3994 (online)

Құрылтайшысы және баспагері: Қазақстан Республикасы Ғылым және жоғары білім министрлігі Ғылым комитеті Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институты ШЖҚ РМК

Ғылыми журнал Қазақстан Республикасы Инвестициялар және даму министрлігінің Байланыс, ақпараттандыру және ақпарат комитетінде 2014 ж. 29 қазанында тіркелген. Тіркеу нөмірі № 14602-ИА. Жылына 4 рет жарияланады (электронды нұсқада).

Журналда тарих ғылымының *келесі бағыттары* бойынша ғылыми жұмыстар жарияланады: тарих (дүниежүзі және Қазақстан тарихы), деректану және тарихнама, археология, этнология, антропология.

Жарияланым тілдері: қазақ, орыс, ағылшын.

Редакция мен баспаның мекен-жайы:

050010 Қазақстан Республикасы, Алматы қ., Шевченко көш., 28-үй

ҚР ҒЖБМ ҒК Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институты ШЖҚ РМК

Тел.: +7 (727) 261-67-19, +7 (727) 272-47-59

E-mail: edu.history@bk.ru

Журнал сайты: <https://edu.e-history.kz>

© Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы
Тарих және этнология институты 2024
© Авторлар ұжымы, 2024

БАС РЕДАКТОР

Қабылдинов Зиябек Ермұқанұлы — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, ҚР ҰҒА корр.-мүшесі, ҚР ҒЖБМ ҒКШ.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институтының бас директоры. (Қазақстан)

РЕДАКЦИЯЛЫҚ АЛҚА

Аяған Бүркітбай Ғелманұлы — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, ҚР ҒЖБМ ҒК Мемлекет тарихы институты директорының орынбасары. (Қазақстан)

Әлімбай Нұрсан — тарих ғылымдарының кандидаты, профессор, Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институтының бас ғылыми қызметкері. (Қазақстан)

Әбіл Еркін Аманжолұлы — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, ҚР БҒМ ҒК Мемлекет тарихы институтының директоры. (Қазақстан)

Вернер Кунтһиа (Werner, Cynthia) — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Техас университеті. (АҚШ).

Голден Кэти Стромайл (Kathie Stromile Golden) — PhD, Миссисипи өңірлік мемлекеттік университеті (Mississippi Valley State University). (АҚШ)

Кәрібаев Берекет Бақытжанұлы — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, ҚР ҰҒА академигі, Өл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті, «Қазақстан тарихы» кафедрасының меңгерушісі. (Қазақстан)

Қожамжарова Дария Пернешқызы — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, ҚР ҰҒА академигі, М. Әуезов атындағы Оңтүстік Қазақстан университетінің ректоры. (Қазақстан)

Кожирова Светлана Басиевна — саясаттану ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Фудан Университетінің Қытай және Орталық Азияны зерттеу орталығының мен «Астана» ХҒК бірлескен директоры. (Қазақстан)

Дайнер Александр (Diener Alexander) — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Канзас университеті. (АҚШ)

Көкебаева Гүлжауһар Кәкенқызы — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Абай атындағы Қазақ ұлттық педагогикалық университеті. (Қазақстан)

Көмеков Болат Ешмұхамедұлы — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, ҚР ҰҒА академигі, Өл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті Халықаралық қыпшақтану институтының директоры, Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университетінің профессоры. (Қазақстан)

Матыжанов Кенжехан Ісләмжанұлы — филология ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, ҚР ҰҒА корр.-мүшесі, М.О. Әуезов атындағы әдебиет және өнер институтының директоры. (Қазақстан)

Моррисон Александр (Morrison Alexander) — PhD, Оксфорд университетінің профессоры. (Ұлыбритания)

Муминов Ашірбек Құрбанұлы — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Ислам тарихы, өнер және мәдениет ғылыми-зерттеу орталығының аға ғылыми қызметкері IRCICA – İslam Tarih, Sanat ve Kültür Araştırma Merkezi. (Түркия)

Римантас Желвис (Želvys Rimantas) — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Вильнюс педагогикалық университеті. (Литва)

Самашев Зайнолла Самашұлы — археолог, тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Герман археология институтының корр.-мүшесі. ҚР ҒЖБМ ҒК Ө. Марғұлан атындағы Археология институты. (Қазақстан)

Смағұлов Оразақ Смағұлұлы — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, ҚР ҰҒА академигі, Балон ғылым академиясының корр.-мүшесі, Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы сыйлықтың лауреаты, ғылым мен техниканың еңбек сіңірген қайраткері, Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университетінің профессоры. (Қазақстан)

Сыдықов Ерлан Бәтташұлы — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университетінің ректоры. (Қазақстан)

Таймағамбетов Жәкен Қожахметұлы — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, ҚР ҰҒА академигі, ҚР Ұлттық музейі. (Қазақстан)

ЖАУАПТЫ РЕДАКТОР

Қаипбаева Айнагүл Толғанбайқызы — тарих ғылымдарының кандидаты, қауымдастырылған профессор, Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институтының жетекші ғылыми қызметкері. (Қазақстан)

ҒЫЛЫМИ РЕДАКТОРЛАР

Қозыбаева Махаббат Мәлікқызы — PhD, Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институтының Астана қаласындағы филиалының директоры. (Қазақстан)

Қапаева Айжан Тоқанқызы — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институтының Бас ғылыми қызметкері. (Қазақстан)

Кубеев Рустем Жаулыбайұлы — Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институтының ғылыми қызметкері. (Қазақстан)

ТЕХНИКАЛЫҚ ХАТШЫ

Копеева Сания Жуматайқызы — Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институтының қызметкері. (Қазақстан).

ISSN 2710-3994 (online)

Учредитель и издатель: РГП на ПХВ «Институт истории и этнологии им.Ч.Ч. Валиханова»
Комитета науки Министерства науки и высшего образования Республики Казахстан

Научный журнал зарегистрирован в Комитете связи, информатизации и информации
Министерства по инвестициям и развитию Республики Казахстан, свидетельство
о регистрации:

№ 14602-ИА от 29.10.2014 г. Публикуется 4 раза в год (в электронном формате).

В журнале публикуются научные работы *по следующим направлениям* исторической науки:
история (всемирная история и история Казахстана), источниковедение и историография,
археология, этнология, антропология.

Языки публикации: казахский, русский, английский.

Адрес редакции и издательства:

050010 Республика Казахстан, г. Алматы, ул. Шевченко, д. 28

РГП на ПХВ Институт истории и этнологии им. Ч.Ч. Валиханова КН МНВО РК

Тел.: +7 (727) 261-67-19, +7 (727) 272-47-59

Е-mail: edu.history@bk.ru

Сайт журнала: <https://edu.e-history.kz>

© Институт истории и этнологии
имени Ч.Ч. Валиханова, 2024
© Коллектив авторов, 2024

ГЛАВНЫЙ РЕДАКТОР

Кабульдинов Зиябек Ермуханович — доктор исторических наук, профессор, чл.-корр. НАН РК, генеральный директор Института истории и этнологии им. Ч.Ч. Валиханова КН МНВО РК. (Казахстан)

РЕДАКЦИОННАЯ КОЛЛЕГИЯ

Алимбай Нурсан — кандидат исторических наук, профессор, главный научный сотрудник Института истории и этнологии им. Ч.Ч. Валиханова. (Казахстан)

Абиля Еркин Аманжолович — доктор исторических наук, профессор, директор Института истории государства КН МНВО РК. (Казахстан)

Аяган Буркитбай Гелманович — доктор исторических наук, профессор, заместитель директора Института истории государства КН МНВО РК. (Казахстан)

Вернер Синтия (Werner, Cynthia) — доктор исторических наук, профессор. Техасский университет. (США)

Голден Кэтти Стромилл (Kathie Stromile Golden) — PhD, Государственный университет долины Миссисипи (Mississippi Valley State University). (США)

Дайнер Александр (Diener Alexander) — доктор исторических наук, профессор. Канзасский университет. (США)

Исмагулов Оразак Исмагулович — доктор исторических наук, профессор, академик НАН РК, член-корр. Болонской академии наук, лауреат премии им. Ч.Ч. Валиханова, заслуженный деятель науки и техники, профессор Евразийского национального университета имени Л.Н. Гумилева. (Казахстан)

Карибаев Берекет Бахытжанович — доктор исторических наук, профессор, академик НАН РК, заведующий кафедрой истории Казахстана, Казахский национальный университет им. аль-Фараби. (Казахстан)

Кожамжарова Дария Пернешовна — доктор исторических наук, профессор, академик НАН РК, ректор Южно-Казахстанского университета им. М. Ауэзова. (Казахстан)

Кожирова Светлана Басиевна — доктор политических наук, профессор, содиректор Центра исследования Китая и Центральной Азии Фуданьского Университета и МНК «Астана», руководитель Центра китайских и азиатских исследований. (Казахстан)

Кокебаева Гульжаухар Какеновна — доктор исторических наук, профессор Казахского национального педагогического университета имени Абая. (Казахстан)

Кумеков Болат Ешмухамбетович — доктор исторических наук, профессор, академик НАН РК, директор Международного института кипчаковедения Казахского национального университета имени аль-Фараби, профессор Евразийского национального университета имени Л.Н. Гумилева. (Казахстан)

Матыжанов Кенжехан Слямжанович — доктор филологических наук, профессор, чл.-корр. НАН РК, директор Института литературы и искусства им. М. Ауэзова. (Казахстан)

Моррисон Александр (Morrison Alexander) — PhD, профессор Оксфордского университета. (Великобритания)

Муминов Аширбек Курбанович — доктор исторических наук, профессор, старший научный сотрудник Исследовательского центра исламской истории, искусства и культуры. IRCICA – İslâm Tarih, Sanat ve Kültür Araştırma Merkezi. (Турция)

Римантас Желвис (Zelvys Rimantas) — доктор педагогических наук, профессор, Вильнюсский педагогический университет. (Литва)

Самашев Зайнолла Самашевич — археолог, доктор исторических наук, профессор, чл.-корр. Германского археологического института. Институт археологии им. А. Маргулана КН МНВО РК. (Казахстан)

Сыдыков Ерлан Батташевич — доктор исторических наук, профессор, академик НАН РК, ректор Евразийского национального университета им. Л.Н. Гумилева. (Казахстан)

Таймагамбетов Жакен Кожаметович — доктор исторических наук, профессор, академик НАН РК, Национальный музей РК. (Казахстан)

ОТВЕТСТВЕННЫЙ РЕДАКТОР

Каипбаева Айнагуль Толганбаевна — кандидат исторических наук, ведущий научный сотрудник Института истории и этнологии им. Ч.Ч. Валиханова. (Казахстан)

НАУЧНЫЕ РЕДАКТОРЫ

Козыбаева Махаббат Маликовна — PhD, директор филиала в г. Астана Института истории и этнологии им. Ч.Ч. Валиханова. (Казахстан)

Капаева Айжан Токановна — доктор исторических наук, профессор, главный научный сотрудник Института истории этнологии им. Ч.Ч. Валиханова. (Казахстан)

Кубеев Рустем Джаулыбайулы — научный сотрудник Института истории и этнологии им. Ч.Ч. Валиханова. (Казахстан)

ТЕХНИЧЕСКИЙ СЕКРЕТАРЬ

Копеева Сания Жуматаевна — сотрудник Института истории и этнологии им. Ч.Ч. Валиханова. (Казахстан)

ISSN 2710-3994 (online)

Founder and publisher: RSE on REM “Ch.Ch. Valikhanov Institute of History and Ethnology” of the Committee of Science of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Kazakhstan

The scientific journal is registered at the Committee for Communications, Informatization and Information of the Ministry for Investments and Development of the Republic of Kazakhstan, registration certificate: No. 14602-IIA dated October 29, 2014. The journal is published 4 times a year (in electronic format).

The journal publishes scientific works in the *following areas* of historical science: history (world history and history of Kazakhstan), source studies and historiography, archeology, ethnology, anthropology.

Publication languages: Kazakh, Russian, English.

Editorial and publisher address:

28 Shevchenko Str., 050010, Almaty, Republic of Kazakhstan

RSE on REM Ch.Ch. Valikhanov Institute of History and Ethnology CS MSHE of the Republic of Kazakhstan

Tel.: +7 (727) 261-67-19, +7 (727) 272-47-59

E-mail: edu.history@bk.ru

Journal website: <https://edu.e-history.kz>

© Ch.Ch. Valikhanov Institute
of History and Ethnology, 2024
© Group of authors, 2024

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

Kabuldinov Ziabek Ermukhanovich — Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Corresponding Member of the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan, General Director of Ch.Ch. Valikhanov Institute of History and Ethnology SC MSHE RK. (Kazakhstan)

EDITORIAL BOARD

Alimbay Nursan — Candidate of Historical Sciences, Professor, Chief Researcher at the Ch.Ch. Valikhanov Institute of History and Ethnology. (Kazakhstan)

Abil Yerkin Amanzholovich — Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Director of the Institute of History of the State CS MES RK. (Kazakhstan)

Ayagan Burkitbai Gelmanovich — Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Deputy Director of the Institute of History of the State SCMSHE RK. (Kazakhstan)

Werner, Cynthia — Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Texas university. (USA)

Golden Kathie Stromile — PhD, Mississippi Valley State University. (USA)

Ismagulov Orazak Ismagulovich — Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Academician of the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Corresponding Member of Bologna Academy of Sciences, winner of Ch.Ch. Valikhanov Award, Honored Worker of Science and Technology, Professor of L.N. Gumilyov University. (Kazakhstan)

Karibayev Bereket Bakhytzhonovich — Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Academician of the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Head of the Department of History of Kazakhstan, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University. (Kazakhstan)

Kozhamzharova Daria Perneshovna — Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Academician of the NAS of the Republic of Kazakhstan, rector of the M. Auezov South Kazakhstan University. (Kazakhstan)

Kozhirova Svetlana Bassieva — Doctor of Political Science, Professor, Co-Director of the Center for the Study of China and Central Asia of Fudan University and the International Scientific Complex of the National Company "Astana", Head of the Center for Chinese and Asian Studies. (Kazakhstan)

Diener Alexander — Doctor of Political Science, Professor, University of Kansas. (USA)

Kokebayeva Gulzhaukhar Kakenovna — Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor at the Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University. (Kazakhstan)

Kumekov Bolat Eshmukhambetovich — Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Academician of the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Director of the International Institute of Kipchak Studies of the Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Professor at L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University. (Kazakhstan)

Matyazhanov Kenzhekhan Slyamzhanovich — Doctor of Philology, Professor, Corresponding Member of the NAS RK, Director of M. Auezov Institute of Literature and Art. (Kazakhstan)

Morrison Alexander — PhD, Professor, University of Oxford. (UK)

Muminov Ashirbek Kurbanovich — Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Senior Researcher at the Research Center for Islamic History, Art and Culture. IRCICA (İslâm Tarih, Sanat ve Kültür Araştırma Merkezi). (Turkey)

Rimantas Želvys — Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Professor, Vilnius Pedagogical University. (Lithuania)

Samashev Zainolla Samashevich — archaeologist, Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Corresponding Member of German Archaeological Institute. A. Marghulan Institute of Archeology SC MSHE RK. (Kazakhstan)

Sydykov Erlan Battashevich — Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Academician of the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Rector of L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University. (Kazakhstan)

Taimagambetov Zhaken Kozhakhmetovich — Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Academician of the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan, National Museum of the Republic of Kazakhstan. (Kazakhstan)

EXECUTIVE EDITOR

Kaipbayeva Ainagul Tolganbayevna — Candidate of Historical Sciences, leading researcher at Ch.Ch. Valikhanov Institute of History and Ethnology (Kazakhstan).

ACADEMIC EDITOR

Kozybayeva Makhabbat Malikovna — PhD, Director of Astana branch of the Ch.Ch. Valikhanov Institute of History and Ethnology. (Kazakhstan)

Kapaeva Aizhan Tokanovna — Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Chief Researcher at the Ch.Ch. Valikhanov Institute of History and Ethnology. (Kazakhstan)

Kubeyev Rustem Dzhaulybayuly — researcher at Ch.Ch. Valikhanov Institute of History and Ethnology. (Kazakhstan)

TECHNICAL SECRETARY

Kopeyeva Saniya Zhumataevna — researcher at Ch.Ch. Valikhanov Institute of History and Ethnology. (Kazakhstan)

ТЕОРИЯ ЖӘНЕ ӘДІСНАМА / ТЕОРИЯ И МЕТОДОЛОГИЯ / THEORY AND METHODOLOGY


Published in the Republic of Kazakhstan
Electronic scientific journal “edu.e-history.kz”
Has been issued as a journal since 2014
ISSN 2710-3994.


Vol. 11. Is. 1, pp. 7–23, 2024
Journal homepage: <https://edu.e-history.kz>

FTAXP / MPHTH / IRSTI 03.20
https://doi.org/10.51943/2710-3994_2024_37_1_7-23

FROM THE HISTORY OF NATIONAL-TERRITORIAL DEMARCATION OF TURKESTAN

Zhanat Akhmetova¹, Mirzahan Egamberdiyev^{2}*

¹Kazakh National Women Pedagogical University
(114, Gogolya Str., 0050040 Almaty, Republic of Kazakhstan)
Candidate of Historical Sciences, Senior Lecturer
 <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6671-1954>. E-mail: akhmetova.zhanat73@gmail.com

²Al-Farabi Kazakh National University
(95, Karasai Batyr Str., 0050040 Almaty, Republic of Kazakhstan)
Candidate of Historical Sciences, Associate Professor
 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1022-0483>. E-mail: mirzahan.egamberdiyev@gmail.com

*Correspondent author

© Ch.Ch. Valikhanov IHE, 2024
© Akhmetova Zh., Egamberdiyev M., 2024

Abstract. *Introduction.* Having come to power, the Bolsheviks faced the rise of the national liberation movement in all national regions of Russia and the strengthening of Turkic unity and solidarity. Lenin, as the main ideologist of the national policy of the RCP(b), well understood the danger of the idea of Turkic unity, the difficulties before the process of establishing Soviet power in the national regions of the empire, as well as the need to quickly prevent Turkic unity in the developing Civil War. With his proposal, the importance of the national problem in the hierarchy of party priorities increased, the party began to amend its theoretical schemes and clarify the practical steps for its solution, taking into account regional peculiarities. *Goals and objectives of the study.* This study examines the evolution of the national policy of the RCP(b) in Turkestan on the example of the institution of the autonomous Soviet republic and the party structure, which aims to rethink the history of the national-territorial demarcation of Turkestan. *Results.* Modern researchers, allowing a better understanding of the political processes in the Turkestan region after the February Revolution, laid the foundation for the national liberation movement of the Turkic-Muslim peoples against the Bolsheviks, which took the character of jadidism and «Basmachi». In a number of studies there are opinions that the Soviet government continued the Russian imperialist policy. In addition, without denying the enormous social costs of the establishment of Soviet

power in the vast territories of the Turkic peoples, it should be noted that it removed the local liberal intelligentsia from power and prevented the «Basmachi movement», which determined the subsequent course of events and the nature of Bolshevik reconstruction, including the logic of nation-building. *Conclusion.* The February Revolution raised hopes of independence for the colonized peoples under the tsarist government, followed by the creation of the Turkestan Autonomy, which in turn was reorganized by the Bolsheviks into the Turkestan AKSR. In 1924, the policy of partitioning Central Asia and Kazakhstan was implemented in order to completely destroy this structure, contradicting Lenin's Bolshevik policy.

Keywords: February Revolution, Turkestan, Lenin, Central Asia, Kazakhstan, demarcation, national territories

For citation: Akhmetova Zh., Egamberdiyev M., From the history of national-territorial demarcation of Turkestan // Electronic scientific journal "edu.e-history.kz". 2024. Vol. 11. No. 1. Pp. 7–23 (In Eng.). DOI: 10.51943/2710-3994_2024_11_1_7-23

ТҮРКІСТАННЫҢ ҰЛТТЫҚ-ТЕРРИТОРИЯЛЫҚ ТҮРҒЫДАН МЕЖЕЛЕНУ ТАРИХЫНАН

Жанат Ахметова¹, Мырзахан Эгамбердиев^{2}*

¹Қазақ Ұлттық қыздар педагогикалық университеті

(114-үй, Гоголь көш., 0050040 Алматы, Қазақстан Республикасы)


Тарих ғылымдарының кандидаты, аға оқытушы

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6671-1954>. E-mail: akhmetova.zhanat73@gmail.com

²Әл-Фараби атындағы ҚазҰУ

(95-үй, Қарасай Батыр көш., 0050040 Алматы, Қазақстан Республикасы)

Тарих ғылымдарының кандидаты, қауымдастырылған профессор (доцент)

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1022-0483>. E-mail: mirzahan.egamberdiyev@gmail.com

*Автор-корреспондент

© Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы ТЭИ, 2024

© Ахметова Ж., Эгамбердиев М., 2024

Аңдатпа. *Kіріспе.* Билікке келгеннен кейін большевиктер Ресейдің барлық ұлттық аймақтарда ұлт-азаттық қозғалыстардың өрбуі және түрік бірлігі мен ынтымақтастығының күшеюімен бетпе-бет келді. В. Ленин РКП(б)-ның ұлттық саясатының басты идеологы ретінде, түрік бірлігі идеясының қауіпін жақсы түсінді, империяның ұлттық аймақтарында Кеңес өкіметін орнату процесіне дейінгі қиындықтарды, сондай-ақ өркендеп келе жатқан Азамат соғысы жағдайында түрікшілдіктің тез арада алдын алуды қажет деп білді. Оның ұсынысымен партиялық басымдықтардың иерархиясындағы ұлттық мәселенің маңызы артты, партия өзінің теориялық схемаларына түзетулер енгізе бастады және аймақтық ерекшеліктерді ескере отырып, оны шешу үшін практикалық қадамдарды жасауды нақтылады. *Зерттеудің мақсаты мен міндеттері.* Бұл

зерттеуде РКП(б)-ның Түркістандағы ұлттық саясаттың эволюциясын автономды кеңестік республиканың институты мен партия құрылысының мысалымен қарастырып, Түркістанның ұлттық-территориялық тұрғыдан межелену тарихын қайтадан ой елегінен өткізу мақсат етілді. *Нәтижелер.* Ақпан төңкерісінен кейінгі Түркістан өңіріндегі саяси процестердің көрінісін жақсырақ ұғынуға мүмкіндік беретін қазіргі зерттеушілердің негізінен большевиктерге қарсы түркі-мұсылман халықтарының жәдидтішілдік пен «басмашылық» сипатын алған ұлт-азаттық қозғалыстарын бастап кетті. Бірқатар зерттеулерде кеңестік биліктің ресейлік империалистік саясатын жалғастырды деген пікірлер де жоқ емес. Осыған қоса түркі халықтарының кең байтақ алқаптарында Кеңес өкіметін құрудың үлкен әлеуметтік шығындарын жоққа шығармай, жергілікті либералды интеллигенцияны биліктен алып тастап, большевиктік қайта құрудың кейінгі сипатын, оның ішінде ұлттық құрылыстың логикасын анықтайтын «басмашылар соғысының» алдын алғанын атаған жөн. *Қорытынды.* Ақпан революциясы патшалық билік тұсында отарланған ұлттарға тәуелсіздік үмітін арттырды, артынан Түркістан Автономиясы құрылды, ол өз кезегінде Түркістан АКСР деп большевиктер тарапынан қайта құрылды. В.И. Лениннің большевиктік саясатына қарсы келетін бұл құрылысты түбегейлі жою мақсатында 1924 жылы Орта Азия және Қазақстанды межелеу саясаты жүзеге асырылды.

Түйін сөздер: Ақпан революциясы, Түркістан, Ленин, Орта Азия, Қазақстан, межелеу, ұлттық территориялар

Дәйексөз үшін: Ахметова Ж., Эгамбердиев М. Түркістанның ұлттық-территориялық тұрғыдан межелену тарихынан // «Edu.e-history.kz» электрондық ғылыми журналы. 2024. Т. 11. № 1. 7–23 бб. (Ағылш.). DOI: 10.51943/2710-3994_2024_11_1_7-23

ИЗ ИСТОРИИ НАЦИОНАЛЬНО-ТЕРРИТОРИАЛЬНОГО РАЗМЕЖЕВАНИЯ ТУРКЕСТАНА

Жанат Ахметова^{1}, Мырзахан Эгамбердиев^{2*}*


¹Казахский национальный женский педагогический университет
(д. 114, ул., Гоголя, 050040 Алматы, Республика Казахстан)

Кандидат исторических наук, старший преподаватель

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6671-1954>. E-mail: akhmetova.zhanat73@gmail.com

²Казахский национальный университет имени аль-Фараби
(д. 95, ул. Карасай батыра, 050040 Алматы, Республика Казахстан)

Кандидат исторических наук, ассоциированный профессор (доцент)

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1022-0483>. E-mail: mirzahan.egamberdiyev@gmail.com

*Корреспондирующий автор

© ИИЭ имени Ч.Ч. Валиханова, 2024

© Ахметова Ж., Эгамбердиев М., 2024

Аннотация. *Введение.* Придя к власти, большевики столкнулись с подъемом национально-освободительного движения во всех национальных регионах России и укреплении тюркского единства и солидарности. В. Ленин, как главный идеолог национальной политики РКП(б), хорошо понимал опасность идеи тюркского единства, трудности перед процессом установления Советской власти в национальных областях империи, а также необходимость быстрого

предотвращения тюркского единения в условиях развивающейся Гражданской войны. С его предложением возросло значение национальной проблемы в иерархии партийных приоритетов, партия стала вносить поправки в свои теоретические схемы и уточнять практические шаги по ее решению с учетом региональных особенностей. *Цель и задачи исследования.* В данном исследовании эволюция национальной политики РКП(б) в Туркестане рассматривается на примере института автономной советской республики и партийной структуры, которая направлена на переосмысление истории национально-территориального размежевания Туркестана. *Результаты.* Современные исследователи, позволяющие лучше понять политические процессы в Туркестанском крае после Февральской революции, положили начало национально-освободительному движению тюрко-мусульманских народов против большевиков, принявшему характер джадидизма и «басмачества». В ряде исследований существуют мнения, что советское правительство продолжало российскую империалистическую политику. Кроме того, не отрицая огромных социальных издержек установления советской власти на обширных территориях тюркских народов, следует отметить, что она отстранила местную либеральную интеллигенцию от власти и предотвратила «басмаческое движение», что предопределило последующий ход событий и характер большевистской реконструкции, включая логику национального строительства. *Заключение.* Февральская революция породила надежды на независимость колонизированных народов под царским правительством, после чего последовало создание Туркестанской автономии, которая, в свою очередь, была реорганизована большевиками в Туркестанскую АКСР. В 1924 году была реализована политика размежевания Средней Азии и Казахстана с целью полного разрушения этой структуры, противоречащей большевистской политике В. И. Ленина.

Ключевые слова: Февральская революция, Туркестан, Ленин, Средняя Азия, Казахстан, размежевание, национальные территории

Для цитирования: Ахметова Ж., Эгамбердиев М. Из истории национально-территориального размежевания Туркестана // Электронный научный журнал «edu.e-history.kz». 2024. Т. 11. № 1. С. 7–23. (На Англ.). DOI: 10.51943/2710-3994_2024_11_1_7-23

Introduction

The problem of studying the history of territorial demarcation in Soviet and domestic historiography and the dynamics of the political situation in Turkestan was subordinated to the logic of the entire Russian revolutionary process. Against the background of the food crisis in the villages and the deterioration of the socio-economic situation, the authority of the Provisional Government within the framework of the Turkestan Committee was marked. At the same time, public sentiment was focused on national liberation uprisings, the strengthening of the Bolsheviks in the cities of European Russia, the Soviets of Workers' and Military Deputies, and the balance of political forces in Turkestan. By September the Bolshevik program had gained the support of army committees and railroad workers' unions. At the end of August, after the Kornilov uprising, the local Bolsheviks, who had realized the creation of the RSDLP(b), adopted a resolution at the Tashkent Council of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies to transfer all power to the Soviets. In general, the proclamation of Soviet power in Tashkent and then in Turkestan followed Moscow's scenario. Relying on the military, the Tashkent Soviets seized power three days after the October Revolution in Petrograd (RSACH. F. 71. I. 34. C. 1475. Pp. 7–9).

The peculiarity of the proclamation of Soviet power in Turkestan was that the Soviets represented the interests of the local Russian-speaking population as democratic authorities. At that time, the local Turkic peoples had not formed as a class of «proletariat» and were not widely spread in the Soviets, military units formed from the local population practically did not exist. In turn, the local socio-political organizations «Shuroi-Islamiya» and «Ulama Jamat» declared the actions of the Bolsheviks since September 1917 a seizure of power to grant the region the status of national-territorial autonomy, and the

Soviets proclaimed «Power belongs to the Soviets!» stating that this slogan was contrary to the interests of the Turkic-Muslim people. When they came to power, V. Lenin and I. Stalin's theoretical constructs on the national question were dominated by the class approach. The problems of nations and national statehood were perceived as a phenomenon of the capitalist formation, and the right to national autonomy and independence was considered only as a transitional stage in the process of creating a proletarian unitary state (Ishakov, 2004: 27–31). The first decisions of the Soviet government on the national question: the «Declaration of the Rights of the Russian People» and the appeal to «All Working Muslims of Russia and the East», issued in November-December 1917, guaranteed the right to self-government, freedom of religion and preservation of the culture and traditions of the peoples. (Agzamkhodzhayev, 2005: 19–22). These statements were primarily aimed at increasing the confidence of the Turkic-Muslim people in the new government and erasing the traces of colonialism left by the new government. It should be noted that the attitude of the central bodies of the RSDLP(b) to the national question at that time was mainly declarative in nature, and the national policy was characterized by a high level of conjuncture.

Soviet power in Turkestan was proclaimed as a dictatorship of the workers on the class principle, but limited to a very narrow social base on the national principle. At the same time, the issue of autonomy of the region as a whole was not reflected in the decisions of the Congress. In this regard, according to A. Khalid, the reason why the Bolsheviks did not allow the Turkic-Muslims in was because they controlled the distribution of food during the shortages (RSACH. F. 71. I. 34. C. 1475. Pp. 12–14).

Thus, the agenda of creating a Turkestan republic, even as an autonomy, was not part of the Bolsheviks' policy plans, which eventually led to a policy of partitioning the whole of Turkestan, after which five new Soviet national republics were formed on the political map. Subsequently, constitutions were issued, which eventually led to the complete dependence of the national republics on the Russian Empire, already in the form of the Soviet state.

Materials and methods

After the collapse of the Soviet Union, a number of independent states emerged in the Central Asian region. Since that time, the media have periodically raised issues related to the territorial claims of the young republics. In the opinion of Central Asian historians, many border problems arose as a result of the national-territorial demarcation of the region carried out in 1924–1925 (Caroe, 1953: 135–144). In Soviet literature, it was believed that the aim of the project was to eradicate ethnic discord and facilitate the process of forming socialist nations in Turkestan. Modern literature is dominated by the assertion that Central Asia could have posed a threat to the young Soviet republic. This was due to the fact that in the region, where several million Muslims lived, pockets of resistance to Soviet power based on the ideas of Pan-Turkism and Pan-Islamism could arise. In foreign literature there is an opinion that the demarcation was in fact a «Soviet experiment» and an expression of the «divide and rule» policy.

The materials of Turkish, Uzbek and Russian authors were used in this study. As a source material, the archival data of the Central State Archive of the Republic of Uzbekistan and the State Historical Archive of the Russian Federation were attracted. The main methods of research were used content analysis of sources, the principle of historicism, diachronic analysis of historical processes after the revolution of 1917, as well as the prerequisites of the division of Turkestan.

Discussion

The Kazakh national elite published the problem of historiography of this scientific work in their works. Among them, Mustafa Shokai, a political émigré, was one of the first intellectuals who openly opposed the policy of dismemberment of Turkestan. In one of his works he wrote: «Such artificial and forcible dismemberment of Turkestan allowed the Soviet government, firstly, to fight the aspiration of Turkic-Muslim peoples of Turkestan to strengthen their national-political unity even under the Soviet

flag, and secondly, Stalin's definition of «national nation in name only, international and socialist nation in internal content» was only necessary for the successful implementation of the «policy» of «nationalization» (Shokai, 1993: 245). According to M. Shokai in fact the Bolsheviks intended in their national policy in Turkestan to prove the policy of the old Russian colonial imperialism and to establish Russian power.

Being a witness of the events of the Bolshevik policy, M. Shokai in his scientific works stated that the Soviet authorities were deathly afraid of the unification of Turkic peoples of Turkestan, they opposed the idea of «United Turkestan» and did everything possible to prevent the strengthening of related Turkic peoples. Back in 1917, when Turkestan autonomy was created, Bolsheviks used the Armenian party Dashnaktsutyun and created the Soviet-type Turkestan ACSR in its place. However, the idea of pan-Turkism did not lose its significance even in this Bolshevik-type autonomous service. Bolsheviks were among those who supported the idea of «integrity of Turkestan». These were prominent representatives of the Kazakh ethno-elite Turar Ryskulov and Sultanbek Kozhanov (Ryskulov, 1997: 547).

S. Kozhanov was one of the participants of the policy of disunification of Turkestan. Kozhanov believed that the political organization of the Turkestan region should be in the form of a federation and initiated the creation of the Central Asian Federation with the inclusion of Kazakhstan. He followed the direction to include the republics flying under the flags of the region, first in the economic community, then in the Central Asian Federation, and then in the Union of Republics – USSR as a powerful economic and political-administrative structure. But this idea of S. Kozhanov was not supported by the Central Asian Bureau of the RC RC(b)P. The Soviet government did not want the unification of the Turkic peoples of Central Asia in any form and prevented this from happening (Khodjayev, 1932: 190).

In the Soviet period there were no special studies on this topic. The attention of scientists was directed to the disclosure of issues of economic zoning in the RSFSR and union republics, to the study of the administrative-territorial structure of the USSR. In addition, there were published works on administrative-territorial changes and zoning of individual regions of the Urals, Siberia and Kazakhstan. Since the 1920s, there have been works that address the problems of zoning of the Soviet state. The works of I.G. Aleksandrov are devoted to the issues of administrative changes (Aleksandrov, 1921: 15). The author argued that the new zoning based on the method of economic gravitation should be the basis for building the future economy of Russia. At the same time, according to the scientist, it was necessary to respect the interests of autonomies and any changes in the boundaries, if required by economic transformation, had to be coordinated with the desire of autonomous entities.

S.I. Sulkevich, being a consultant of the administrative commission of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee, covered in his works the territorial transformations of the Soviet state in the 1920s. He was one of the first to identify the main stages of administrative-territorial construction, considered the process of creation of autonomies in the RSFSR. On the issue of mass unbundling of volosts in 1917–1919, the author pointed out that it was necessary in the conditions of the Civil War, when the situation of instability required a special tension of forces, for which the volost authorities were created to carry out the directives of the Soviet leadership in the field (Sulkevich, 1926: 198–201).

The history of research into the policy of disengagement in Turkestan has traveled a difficult path. If in the 20s–30s of the twentieth century there were individual studies of an objective nature, as can be seen in the works of Mukhamedjan Tynyshbaev, Sanzhar Asfendiyarov, Khalel Dosmukhamedov, then from the mid-1930s the studies began to be conducted under strict party-class control. The authors who did not meet such requirements were punished severely, as evidenced by the tragic fates of many scientists, including those listed above. In the 50s of the twentieth century, a monograph by A. Nusupbekov was published on the principles of Marxism and Leninism. In his scientific work, the author touched upon the complexities of that period. However, taking into account the national policy of the Bolsheviks in Turkestan, the Turkkomissiya on June 5, 1920 in a telegram addressed to V.I. Lenin,

the Presidium of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee and the Central Committee of the RCP(b) pointed out that the immediate dismemberment of the Turkestan Republic into a number of separate national republics would bring chaos to all work in Turkestan and would undoubtedly play into the hands of nationalist elements of the republic, that the political situation dictated the necessity of preserving a unified Turkestan Republic for the time being (Nusupbekov, 1953: 190).

In the work of T.A. Agdarbekov the problems of forming the borders of the Kazakh autonomy with Siberia and Turkestan were revealed (Agdarbekov, 1990: 32). The author wrote that the core of nation-state building in Kazakhstan was the collection and unification of Kazakh lands within the autonomy, which was completed by the mid-1920s. The establishment of the legal status of the republic followed a thorny path, in the struggle of two trends: the tendency to transform the autonomy into an ordinary administrative-territorial unit and the granting of state independence to the republic in resolving internal issues. At the same time, the Kazakh Republic, being a part of the RSFSR, had limited state sovereignty.

In general, in the Soviet period, there was no need for a detailed study of the peculiarities of the delimitation of union republics in the first decades of the USSR. New generations were brought up in the spirit of unity, which was based on the postulates of equality and brotherhood of all peoples, enshrined in one of the first official documents of the Bolsheviks – the «Declaration of the Rights of the Peoples of Russia». In this regard, research in the field of territorial transformations was in the shadow of the research focus, as it could potentially serve as a pretext for the development of nationalist ideas and separatist movements in the Soviet Union.

After the collapse of the Soviet Union, Kazakhstan scientists continued their research on the problems of state building in Kazakhstan. The work of M.A. Maldybekova was devoted to the territorial and state demarcation of the Turkestan Republic (Maldybekova, 2002: 146). The author analyzed the processes of national-state division of Central Asian republics, as a result of which Turkestan autonomy was divided into union republics and autonomous regions. The scientist noted the importance of this stage for the political life of Kazakhstan, as the republic received economically developed regions – Zhetysay and Syr Darya, preserved the national integrity of the Kazakh people.

The processes of national-territorial demarcation of the Siberian territories of the RSFSR with the Kazakh ASSR in the 1920s are covered by E.B. Sadykov (Sadykov, 2011: 64–66). Without denying the importance of Soviet national policy in the formation and strengthening of the borders of the autonomous republic, he notes the steadfastness of the leaders of the Steppe region in the return of «ancestral» lands, such as the Akmola and Semipalatinsk regions. The historian concludes that the administrative-territorial changes between Siberia and the Kazakh ASSR in the 1920s were only a tool in the Bolsheviks' creation of a rigidly centralized state.

In the early 2000s, the problem of the division of Turkestan began to be considered in foreign historiography, where the issues of the Bolsheviks' national policy towards the national peripheries in the 1920s–1930s are highlighted. The work of the German researcher W. Dönninghaus pays special attention to the problems of interaction between the Bolsheviks and the national western peripheries and western minorities, especially the Germans (Dönninghaus, 2011: 727). A detailed analysis of the formation and development of the national policy of Soviet power is given.

The American researcher T. Martin, considering the peculiarities of the Bolsheviks' national policy, came to the conclusion that the unification of the majority of peoples under the wing of Russia took place in the conditions of serious support of national minorities by the Soviets to the detriment of the ethnic majority – the Russian people (Martin, 2011: 662). The author also introduces into scientific circulation a new term «Empire of positive reality», defining the Soviet Union as a special form of statehood.

It can be said that the demarcation of Turkestan was studied to a greater or lesser extent by Uzbek and Russian scholars in the 50s–60s of the last century. However, this issue was not considered as a separate topic. The mentioned issue is often covered in a brief overview within the framework of other

problems. Therefore, scholars have considered this problem predominantly, paying special attention to the last period of the Republic of Turkestan and the process of establishing national republics in Central Asia. Therefore, the politics of Turkestan's disengagement have been studied from a general point of view in relation to these topics. Moreover, in accordance with the ideology and politics of the period, issues contrary to the principles of the party were deliberately glossed over or not mentioned at all. These authors too little considered the aspects of the destination process related to Kazakhstan. There are few Kazakhstani authors who have paid attention to this problem. Except for the monograph published in 1953 by scientist A. Nusipbekov, there are almost no works in this area. Moreover, his study could not comprehensively cover the set goal. The book did not mention economic demarcation, as well as conflicts and disputes during the demarcation of Turkestan.

Recently published scientific work of the authors M. Laruelle, I. Grek, S. Davydov, who considering aspects of national identity Russian/Russian touched on some aspects of the formation of the Soviet state. This study touched upon the problems of the policy of partitioning of Central Asia and Kazakhstan from the point of view of ethno-nationalism and a new form of colonialism as factors of logistic policy of the Russian Empire. What is interesting in this study are the discourses of demarcation and a comparative analysis of contemporary approaches of neo-colonialism (Laruelle, Grek, Davydov, 2023: 3–27).

Results

Prerequisites of the policy of disengagement. Because of the political instability and uncertainty of the Soviet government's positions, the Bolsheviks seized power by force, the leaders of the national liberation movement prepared their project of Turkestan autonomy without waiting for the convening of the Constituent Assembly. Thus, two weeks later, on November 27, 1917, the Fourth Muslim Congress was convened in the city of Kokand, where the famous resolution was adopted: «*The Extraordinary All-Muslim Regional Congress expressed the desire for self-government of the country, the peoples living in Turkestan on the basis of the announcement of the Russian Revolution and declared Turkestan territorially autonomous*» (Buttino, 2007: 121–125). The next day, the congress elected the Provisional People's Autonomous Council consisting of 32 people based on the number of seats allocated to Turkestan at its constituent assembly. The Provisional Government was formed from the 12-member People's Council headed by M. Tynyshpayev, 4 of whom were to be representatives of the European community.

This «special period» was characterized by the tension of interethnic relations in the Turkestan region, first of all by the fact that the principles proclaimed by the Soviet government contradicted the real policy of the Soviet power in the conquered territories, colonialism in the conditions of maintenance and continuation of traditions of discrimination of Turkic peoples (SHA RF F. 122, D. 2, C. 311, L. 25–28). The exploitative policy of the Armenian-Dashnak detachments, which participated in the dissolution of the government of the Turkestan (Kokand) autonomy and then took control of the situation in a number of cities in the Ferghana Valley, is a vivid evidence of this approach.

Indeed, the proclamation in November-December 1917 of Turkestan, Alash, Volga-Ural and Caucasus national Turkic autonomies in the regions of Turkic peoples colonized by Russia and the widespread dissemination of the ideas of national governments and national self-government worried the leaders of the «red empire». That is why the leaders of the Soviet power began to move to concrete practical steps to abolish the state-wide decisions on the autonomy of the Turkic peoples during the civil war. At the III All-Russian Congress held in January 1918, Russia was reorganized into a Soviet Federative State. In April 1918, in a letter to the Council of People's Commissars of the Turkestan region, Stalin explained Moscow's position on the issue of autonomy in the following way: «*Some councils in local regions did not recognize any autonomy and preferred to solve the national question by arms. But I believe that this way is absolutely not suitable for the Soviet power. This way lays the basis for gathering*

the masses around the bourgeois elite and enhances their reputation as saviors and defenders of the homeland, so this situation is considered ineffective for Soviet power. The next task of Soviet policy is not to reject autonomy, but to recognize it» (Deklaratsiya prav narodov Rossii, 1957).

In order to provide organizational assistance to the legalization of Soviet autonomy, the Extraordinary Commissar of the RSFSR Council of People's Commissars sent P.A. Kobozev. On April 30, 1918 at the V Congress of Soviets of Turkestan region was adopted the «Regulations» on the establishment of the Soviet Federative Republic of Turkestan within the RSFSR. After the February Revolution in the ideological and political structures of the Turkestan autonomy, the administrative status of the autonomy of the region was not clearly defined, it was to be only national-territorial (Obrashenie k trudyashimsya musulmanam Rossii i Vostoka, 1957). The republican form of autonomy established a system of power management based on the principle of separation. The highest permanent legislative body of the Turkic Republic was the Central Executive Committee headed by P. A. Kobozev, while the executive power remained in the hands of the Council of People's Commissars headed by Kolesov. Both at the V Congress of Soviets and at the I Congress of the Turkestan Communist Party the main content of the decisions was to take the interests of the Turkic-Muslim proletariat away from the influence of the national intelligentsia and to attract it to their side. of the Soviet government. As a result, 9 out of 37 members of the Turkestan Central Executive Committee and 4 out of 16 members of the Sovnarkom were Turkic-Muslims (Abashin, 2007: 12).

In October 1918, on the initiative of V. Lenin, the Central Bureau of Muslim organizations of the RCP(b) was established to carry out organizational, political and propaganda work among Muslim communists. In Turkestan, as well as in the center, the Turkestan Communist Party formed a network of district and regional Muslim bureaus under the general leadership of the Regional Muslim Bureau at the regional committee. The activities of the Muslim Bureau, in addition to carrying out organizational and propaganda work among the Muslim part of the party, included *«supervision over the activities of the People's Commissariat and other bodies of the Soviet for the correct implementation of the communist program in the part related to Muslims»* (Abashin, 2007: 34–38).

The leadership of the RCP(b) consolidated its power in Turkestan after the defeat of Kolchak's army in September 1919 and decided to send a commission on Turkestan affairs to the region in order to develop measures to strengthen the influence of the Soviet Union. government. The problem of solving the tasks set out in the Turkestan case was directly related to solving the national question, which included the following issues: a clearer legal definition of the status of autonomy and competence in relations with the federal authorities of the republic of Turkestan, the struggle against «local oppressors», access to land and water for the Turkic-Muslim population, and the principles of establishing the Communist Party of Turkestan to ensure accessibility. When the Turkic Commission arrived in Tashkent in November 1919, the party organization of the RCP(b) continued the policy of colonial organization of society during the empire. The Turkestan Communist Party consisted of three loosely interacting structures: the Obkom of the RCP(b), the Obkom of Foreign Communists, and Musburo. Three regional conferences of the Muslim organizations of the Turkestan Communist Party, held in May 1919 – February 1920, revealed the growing dissatisfaction of the Turkic-Muslim communists with the policy of the party and the republic's governing bodies towards the indigenous population, which was considered colonial, and it was considered a continuation of the present colonial policy (Ryskulov, 1997: 41–44).

T. Ryskulov criticized the leadership of the Communist Party of Turkestan in the regional committee and its program of solving the national question, contrary to the instructions of Moscow. In February 1920, T. Ryskulov in his report at the 3rd regional conference of Muslim communist organizations said: *«The party organizations of Turkestan have not understood the tasks facing the proletarian party in the East.... It is necessary to destroy the colonial system of the tsarist era, which complicates the national problem. There is still no party in Turkestan ... The Obkom has no influence on the Muslim masses. The latter are subordinate only to Musburo. If we want to realize our idea in the*

East, we need to change our attitude to the local population, we need to awaken their trust in us» (Ustinov, 1996: 56–59). T. Ryskulov made a proposal to abolish the existing organizational division of the party on the national principle and unite all the communist organizations of Turkestan into one party under the general leadership of the Central Committee of the RCP(b); he wanted to give this name to the Communist Party of Turkic Peoples of Turkestan. As for the question of state-building, he emphasized that the Turkic peoples of the Turkestan ACSR were a nation striving for self-government, and therefore the republic should be called the Turkic Soviet Republic of the RSFSR (Beysembayev, Kulbayev, 1974: 2–5).

T. Ryskulov's desire to strengthen the identity of Turkic-Muslim peoples in the party-republican system of governance was carefully used by the Soviet authorities in the policy of national-regional demarcation of the Turkestan ACSR in the future, and it was felt that the whole of Turkestan should be demarcated quickly. After all, Lenin and Stalin thought at the beginning of the Bolshevik regime that the Turkestan AKSR would jeopardize the integrity of the USSR and the goals of the Russian Empire in the future (Stalin, 1947: 7–9).

In order to justify the right of Turkic-Muslim peoples to establish party and republican bodies in order to give the autonomy of Turkestan a truly national character, T. Ryskulov recreated the concept of the unity of Turkic peoples, the uniqueness of the Turkic nation to which the people of the republic as a whole belong. T. Ryskulov tried to realize the national project of the Turkic Republic based on communist ideology. For example, he called the project of the Turkic Soviet Republic international, because the workers of all Turkic peoples, even if they were not part of the RSFSR, could unite in the future within the framework of this republic (Qozybayev, 1998: 87–92).

The process of disunification of Turkestan. The real power in the management of the Turkestan ACSR and the Turkestan Communist Party was concentrated in the hands of the Turkic Commission and the Revolutionary Military Council of the Turkestan Front. The Regional Committee of the Communist Party of Turkestan and the Central Executive Committee of Turkestan were under the control of the Turkic Commission, although the proportion of Communists among the Turkic peoples was increasing. This situation was perceived by T. Ryskulov and his supporters as a violation of Turkestan's autonomy. Trying to defend his point of view on the organization of power in the Turkestan AKSR, T. Ryskulov decided to appeal directly to the Politburo of the Central Committee of the RCP(b). On May 25, 1920, members of the Turkestan delegation met with V. Lenin and presented him the party responsibilities in Turkestan. What was common in T. Ryskulov's proposals was that the Central Executive Committee of Turkestan and the Council of People's Commissars of Turkestan raised the issues of granting real autonomy to the state bodies of the Turkic Republic and placing local Turkic-Muslim peoples in administrative positions (RSACH. F. 122. I. 1. C. 311. Pp. 25–28).

Having familiarized himself with the report of the Turkestan delegation, V. Lenin advised the Central Committee of the RCP(b) to accept the draft of the Turkic Commission as a future regulation of the Party's duties in Turkestan. The political self-government of Turkestan on the basis of Turkestanism and the formation of military units from the local population were not supported by V. Lenin. In solving other components of the national question in the Turkic Republic, the Bolshevik leadership remained on the same positions. The party retained the name Turkestan Communist Party, and the Turkic Commission retained its influence as the representative of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee, which dealt with the administration of the federal government in the republic. In particular, it controlled international relations, foreign trade, and military affairs (RSACH. F. 17. I. 1. C. 567. Pp. 8–9). At Lenin's suggestion, members of the Turkic Commission were obliged to constantly interact and consult with the Central Executive Committee of Turkestan and the Sovnarkom of Turkestan in order to increase its importance to local party leaders. and to build up an image of its independence. In fact, under the one-party regime, when the Communist Party of Turkestan retained the status of only a regional branch of the RCP(b), the decision-making process in the republic was still dominated

and represented by the central bodies.

It was decided to abandon the division of the Turkic Republic on the ethno-territorial principle in the conditions of the ongoing civil war in Russia, the development of the «leadership» national movement in Turkestan and the weak position of the Turkic Republic. The reason for this was the lack of honest, ideologically educated cadres in Turkestan who firmly believed in Soviet policy. Reports from members of the Turkic Commission and workers of the republican administration to Moscow everywhere reported the weakness of councils and party groups. He declared that the Turkic-Muslim peoples of Turkestan could not be trusted from either a class, national, or professional point of view. M. Frunze and V. Kuibyshev, discussing the fate of Turkestan in the Politburo of the Central Committee of the RCP(b), wrote to V. Lenin that it was too early to create national republics throughout Turkestan because they stated that Turkestan lacked the strength to develop (Sultangaliyev, 1995: 130). The composition of the Turkic Commission changed several times during its work. The departure of the members of the Turkic Commission Sh. Eliava and Y. Rudzudak, as well as the departure of M. Frunze due to a change of place of work, on June 29, 1920 the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the RCP(b) approved the new composition of the Turkic Commission.

After that, the Politburo of the Central Committee of the RCP(b) set the task of rejecting T. Ryskulov's project as the basis of national policy in the region and relieving «Ryskulov's group» from leading positions in the leadership of the Central Committee of the RCP(b). republic. His views were officially regarded as an expression of «bourgeois nationalism». This assessment then passed into Soviet historiography, where his project was defined as «Turkic-nationalist». (Qoygeldiyev, 2004: 94). Since T. Ryskulov did not agree with the nature of the demands made of him and continued to defend his position, on July 10, 1920. Turkic Commission dissolved the Communist Party of Turkestan loyal to him and established a temporary Central Committee of the Communist Party. Instead, N. Torekulov headed the Party of Turkestan. T. Ryskulov was invited to Moscow. In the summer, the entire Soviet apparatus, all party and revcoms of the Turkestan ACSR were re-elected. As a result, Moscow eventually established centralized authority over the establishment of Soviet power, as well as the formulation and interpretation of national approaches to solving problems in the region. The 10th Congress of the RCP(b), held in March 1921, determined the party's final position toward the initiatives of Muslim communists. The Congress condemned anti-party bias on the national question, i.e., great-power chauvinism and local nationalism or Turkism, as dangerous to communism and proletarian internationalism. At the same time, great-power chauvinism was defined as the main threat to the realization of the Party's tasks in the national question, and the struggle against it in Turkestan took the form of an anti-colonial campaign.

In 1920, the issue of national-regional demarcation of all Turkestan was discussed in the party and Soviet structures of Turkestan. At the end of 1919, the idea of creating a Turkic republic within the RSFSR was proposed. According to it, the policy of forming a state structure *«designed to protect the historical, economic and internal interests of the Turkic peoples of the region, to be a single center for all Turks, including those living outside the RSFSR»* was implemented. The project of the Turkic Republic was taken out of the center as the Bolsheviks struggled with the ideas of pan-Turkism and Islamism in the context of the military «primary» national liberation movement that had begun in the region. «Basmachi» National Movement advocated the creation of an independent state on the territory of united Turkestan and declared its name to be the Republic of Turkestan. Therefore, with the direct support of the Central Executive Committee of the Turkestan Commission and the Sovnarkom of the RSFSR, the Communists of Turkestan proposed the Soviet way of state organization in the region (Prilutskii, 1990: 24–27).

The idea of regional-territorial demarcation was determined by the basic rules of the national policy pursued at that time by V. Lenin: «The necessity of this historical event was determined by the basic principle of the Party's program on the national question, the recognition of the right of each

nation to self-determination, to create an independent nation-state» (Nazarov, 1965: 115–119). The Central Bureau of the Central Committee of the RCP(b), established in May 1922, acted as the governing body of this program. In the decision of the Politburo of the Central Bureau of the RCP(b), which was the main organization in the field of party building during the Soviet Union, adopted on October 11, 1924, it was stated: *«The responsibility for all party and Soviet work on the delimitation and organization of the Central Asian republics should be entrusted to the Central Asian Bureau of the Central Committee»* (RSACH. F. 62. I. 1. C. 111. Pp. 1–3).

In Soviet historiography, the Bolshevik policy of disengagement is traditionally presented as progressive. Many works conclude that *«this step was brought about by the unification of the Soviet peoples of Central Asia and their political, economic and cultural backwardness»* (Yakubovskaya, 1972: 78–81). Also, Western researchers were not biased in their assessments of the demarcation of national-state borders in the region, as they were able to clearly articulate Bolshevik goals. Political emigrants forced to leave the USSR studied the policy of the Soviet authorities in the West and expressed their scholarly opinions. Among them, Baymirza Hayt, an ideologue of Uzbek origin, a well-known expert on Central Asia, stationed in West Germany and in contact with the Nazis at the time, considered the policy of disengagement to be the result of the Soviet government's desire to separate and divide the Turkic peoples from each other. According to him, the Soviet government tried to separate the Turkic peoples from each other and *«set up a kind of experiment, created a new Russian nation for the Turkic peoples»* (Baymirza, 1975: 147–148). The author further states that *«Soviet authorities used such concepts as «Uzbek nation», «Kazakh language», «History of Turkmenistan», «Kyrgyz folk customs», «Tajik national culture», «Karakalpak literature», and «national governments».* According to Baimirza Hayt, *«the dream of Turkism is for all Turkic tribes to unite within a single Turkic nation»* (Baymirza, 2004: 34–38). Another political scientist, A. Benigsen, concluded that *«Moscow was able to make extensive use of the method of dividing Muslim peoples in the face of their confrontation, while destroying the unity of the Muslim peoples of Turkestan»* (Beningsen, 1983: 74).

In early 1924, the Soviet government was able to seize the main centers of the «Basmachi» national movement and create a social base for itself in the region in order to start a new national-territorial «redistribution» in the Turkestan ACSR. In February–March 1924, delimitation plans were discussed in the local party organs of the Turkestan SSR, Bukhara and Khiva, which recognized that *«the question of dividing the territory of Soviet Central Asia into a number of republics on the basis of nationality is quite resolved, ripe and its formation very timely»* (RSACH. F. 62. I. 2. C. 87. P. 79–81). The project of creating Uzbek and Turkmen Soviet Republics on the territory of the Turkic Republic, Bukhara and Khorezm was supported by local Soviet elites by transferring part of the lands inhabited by the already existing Kyrgyz (Kazakh) Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic.

In the process of nation-state formation, the project of creating Uzbekistan encountered difficulties. In the case of the creation of the Uzbek Republic, the political elements of nation-building on the part of Moscow manifested themselves most clearly, since the Uzbek national project did not exist in the minds of the regional political elite until the collapse of the Turkestan ACSR. However, the opinion of the local party elite on the boundaries of the new national structure and national identity was also taken into account. According to S. Abashin, *the «Uzbek project» was the result of a compromise between the Bolsheviks and the local elite* (Abashin, 2007: 183–187). At the time, the only option was the idea of Turkism, uniting the national elites of Bukhara, Khorezm and Turkestan, separated by political boundaries. However, this was rejected as an ineffective idea of national identity by the Bolsheviks. And the Bolsheviks did not like the proposals that emerged from the discussion about creating a unified political union along the lines of the Caucasus in Turkestan, and were accused of being close to the «Turkic project» (Tashenov, 1960: 24–27).

After the RCP(b) approved the demarcation plan in April 1924, the institution known as the Turkburo was renamed the Sredazburo, and by May 1924 a special commission was established

to prepare a demarcation plan for the new national republic. The name Turkestan as a whole was officially changed to Central Asia. When solving the issue of dividing certain territories of Central Asia into new national republics, the subcommittees in their work were obliged to proceed from the following principles: the national composition of the majority of the inhabitants of the territory under consideration should be determined on ethnic grounds; the creation of a list based on the way of life of the local population. As a result, the optimality of the process of forming a homogeneous «national identity» in the newly created national Soviet republics and the level of interethnic conflicts were determined, and attention was paid to strengthening the influence of Soviet power in the region (Khalid, 2010: 95–101).

However, already at that time, during the preparation of the border demarcation project, territorial disputes began between local national elites. In most cases, they saw demarcation as an opportunity to expand the territory of their national republics at the expense of neighboring republics. Justification of territorial claims was prepared on the basis of the ethnic composition of the inhabitants of a certain territory. Among the Bolsheviks, the word of all-Turkic unity was completely forgotten. The Soviet leadership, from the Sredazbureau to the central organs of the party, seemed to be looking for compromise solutions at the local level and began to mediate in border disputes. In fact, the Bolsheviks were guided by the national principle and acted from an economic point of view. The Bolsheviks were well aware of the disparity in the economic potential and level of development of the established national republics and in many cases seemed to try to balance this difference. The newly created republics were supposed to be developed on the basis of raw materials, and for each of the created national Soviet republics, directions of development were defined: cotton production in Uzbekistan, heavy industry and agrarian sector in Kazakhstan, cattle breeding in Kyrgyzstan, and light industry in Turkmenistan.

Conclusions

On October 11, 1924, the Politburo of the Central Committee of the RCP(b) made a final decision on national demarcation in Turkestan. The Uzbek and Turkmen republics, which included the territories of the Bukhara and Khiva republics, immediately received the status of union republics within the USSR. Explorations continued until the new borders of the Kyrgyz (Kazakh) Republic, which temporarily retained its autonomous status, were defined. The Soviet authorities continued to glorify national peculiarities, propaganda activities were carried out in an exaggerated form, in this regard, the national problem in each region deepened. The problem of national-territorial delimitation of the Turkestan ACSR continued until the 1930s.

The policy of delimitation of Turkestan in 1924 was carried out in order to block the growth of Turkic unity in the region and to prevent T. Ryskulov's project of «Turkic Republic». In this case, the issue of national-territorial demarcation was, firstly, to stop the trend of Turkic national identity, historically formed in the region, and secondly, to finally eliminate the influence of the political elite, which are the «carriers» of Turkic consciousness. Taking into account the presence of constructive elements in their national policy, the Bolsheviks focused on deepening the historical differences in the culture of local peoples, justifying in the minds of Turkic-Muslim peoples their isolation from each other ethnically and internally, and accelerating this process. Thus, the Bolsheviks, by ensuring the demarcation of national territories, formed the basis of the social hierarchy of each Turkic nation that emerged on a socialist basis, and accelerated the growth of ethnic self-consciousness and the emergence of new variants of local «nationalism» into the future.

According to the principle of conditionality of borders of national state formations, according to which the land did not actually belong to the nations and even their state formations, but was the common property of a single indivisible country – the USSR. The Union Government was the rightful owner of the land, based on political, military-strategic and economic considerations, while the population of the republics was put in the position of mere land users. The Union Government could,

by order, transfer vast territories of one republic to another for perpetual or long-term use.

On the basis of the above, we can say that the work of the commission on the national demarcation of Turkestan, its concrete results not only did not take into account the real situation of the peoples of the region, the original borders of their residence, but also laid a kind of "time mine" in the relations of the states of the region on border issues. Moscow looked at all this as a meaningless game, since all borders in the USSR were conditional. At that time, none of the members of the commission could have imagined that the Union would collapse and the product of their labor would turn into real interstate borders with all the ensuing problems.

Sources

CSA OK — Central State Archive of the Republic of Uzbekistan

RSACH — Russian State Archive of Contemporary History

Источники

ЦГА РУз — Центральный государственный архив Республики Узбекистан

РГАНИ — Российский государственный архив новейшей истории

References

Abashin, 2007 — *Abashin S.* Natsionalizmy v Srednei Azii [Nationalisms in Central Asia]. SPb.: Aleteya, 2007. Pp. 183–187. (In Russ.).

Agzamkhodzhaev, 2005 — *Agzamkhodzhaev S.* Istoriya Turkestanskoi avtonomii [History of the Turkestan Autonomy]. Tashkent: Toshkent Islam universiteti, 2006. 263 p. (In Russ.).

Agdarbekov, 1990 — *Agdarbekov T.A.* Osnovnye problem natsionalno-gosudarstvennogo stroitelstva v Kazahskoi avtonomnoi respublike, 1920–1936 godah [Die Hauptprobleme des Aufbaus des Nationalstaates in der Autonomen Republik Kasachstan in den Jahren 1920–1936]. Avtoreferat dissertatsii doktora yuridicheskikh nauk [Author's abstract of the dissertation of the Doctor of Laws]. Alma-Ata. 1990. 32 p. (In Russ.).

Aleksandrov, 1921 — *Aleksandrov I.G.* Ekonomicheskoe rayonirovanie Rossii [Economic zoning of Russia]. Moscow: Izdatelstvo B.I., 1921. Pp. 15. (In Russ.).

Beysembayev, Kulbayev, 1974 — *Beysembayev S., Kulbayev S.* Turar Ryskulov [Turar Ryskulov]. Alma-ata: Kazakhstan, 1974. 391 p. (In Russ.).

Beningsen, 1983 — *Beningsen A.* Musulmane v SSSR [Muslims in the USSR]. Paris: YMCA-PRESS, 1983. 86 p. (In Russ.).

Buttino, 2007 — *Buttino M.* Revolutsiya naoborot. Srednyaya Aziya mezhdu padeniem tsarskoi imperii i obrazovaniem SSSR [Revolution in reverse. Central Asia between the fall of the tsarist empire and the formation of the USSR]. Moscow: Zven'ya, 2007. Pp. 293–301. (In Russ.).

Caroe, 1953 — *Caroe Olaf.* Soviet Colonialism in Central Asia // Council on Foreign Relations. Vol. 32. No. 1. Pp. 135–144. URL: <https://doi.org/10.2307/20031013> (access date: 01.12.2023).

Deklaratsiya prav narodov Rossii [The Declaration of the Rights of the Peoples of Russia] // Dekrety Sovetskoi vlasti. Moscow: Gos. izd. polit. nauki, 1957. V. 1. Pp. 35–43. Moscow: State Publishing House of Political Science, 1957. Vol. 1. C. 35–43. (In Russ.).

Donninghaus, 2011 — *Donninghaus W.* V teni «Bolshogo Brata»: Zapadnye natsionalnye menshinstva v SSSR (1917–1938 gg.) [In the Shadow of Big Brother: Western National Minorities in the USSR (1917–1938)]. Moscow: Izdatelstvo, Rossiyskaya politicheskaya ensiklopediya, 2011. 727 p. (In Russ.).

Hayit, 1975 — *Hayit Baymirza.* Türkistan Rusya ve Çin Arasında. Alamancadan çeviren Abdülkadir Sadak [Turkestan Between Russia and China. Translated from German by Abdulkadir Sadak]. İstanbul: OtağYayınevi, 1975. 437 p. (In Turk.).

Hayit, 2004 — *Hayit Baymirza.* Türkistan Devletlerinin Milli Mücadele Tarihi [History of National Struggle of Turkestan States]. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 2004. 448 p. (In Turk.).

Iskhakov, 2004 — *Iskhakov S.M.* Rossiiskie musulmane i revoliytsiya [Russian Muslims and the Revolution]. Moscow: Sotsialno-politicheskaya mysl, 2004. 598 p. (In Russ.).

Khalid, 2010 — *Khalid A.* Islam posle kommunizma. Religiya i politika v Tsentralnoi Azii [Islam after Communism. Religion and Politics in Central Asia]. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2010. Pp. 95–101. (In Russ.).

Khodjajev, 1932 — *Khodjajev F.K.* K istorii revolyutsii v Buhare i natsionalnogo razmejevania Srednei Azii [Toward a History of the Revolution in Bukhara and the National Disaggregation of Central Asia]. Tashkent: Gosudarstvennoe isdatelstvo UaSSR, 1932. 190 p. (In Russ.).

Laruelle, Grek, Davydov, 2023 — *Laruelle Marlene, Grek Ivan, Davydov Sergey.* Culturalizing the Nation: A Quantitative Approach to the Russkii/Rossiiskii Semantic Space in Russia's Political Discourse // *Demokratizatsiya: The Journal of Post-Soviet Democratization*, Institute for European, Russian, and Eurasian Studies, The George Washington University, 2023. Vol. 31. No. 1. Pp. 3–27.

Maldybekova, 2002 — *Maldybekova M.A.* Razmejevanie Turkestanskoi Respubliki i problemy territorialnoi tselostnosti Kazahskoi ASSR [Partitioning of the Turkestan Republic and problems of territorial integrity of the Kazakh ASSR]. Dissertatsia kandidata istoricheskikh nauk. Turkestan, 2002. 146 p. (In Russ.).

Martin, 2011 — *Martin T.* Imperia «polojitelnoi deyatelnosti». Natsii i natsionalizm v SSSR. 1923–1939 [The Empire of «Affirmative Action». Nations and Nationalism in the USSR, 1923–1939]. Moscow: Fond Prezidentskiy tsentr: B.N. Yeltsina: ROSSPEN, 2011. 662 p. (In Russ.).

Nazarov, 1965 — *Nazarov S.A.* Iz istorii deyatelnosti Sredazbiyro TSK VKP(b) (1922–1924 gg.) [From the history of the activities of the Central Asian Bureau of the Central Committee of the CPSU(b) (1922–1924)]. Tashkent: Uzbekistan, 1965. Pp. 115–119. (In Russ.).

Nusupbekov, 1953 — *Nusupbekov A.* Obyedinenie kazahskikh zemel v Kazahskoi Sovetskoj Sotsialisticheskoi Respublike [Unification of Kazakh lands in the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic]. Alma-Ata: Izdatelstvo Akademii nauk Kazahskoi SSR, 1953. 190 p. (In Russ.).

Prilutskii, 1990 — *Prilutskii E.A.* Nekotorye voprosy formirovaniya sovetskoj natsionalnoi gosudarstvennosti v Turkestane [Some Issues of the Formation of Soviet National Statehood in Turkestan] // *Obshestvennye nauki v Uzbekistane*, 1990. No. 6. Pp. 24–27. (In Russ.).

Ryskulov, 1997 — *Ryskulov T.* Sobranie sochinenii v 3-h tomah, Tom 2 [Collected Works in 3 Volumes. Vol. 2]. Almaty: Kazakstan, 1997. Pp. 33–197. (In Russ.).

Sadykov, 2011 — *Sadykov E.B.* Gosudarstvenno-territorialnoe razmejevanie Kazakhstana i Sibkraya v kontekste natsionalnoi politiki 1920-h godov [State-territorial demarcation of Kazakhstan and Sibkrai in the context of the national policy of the 1920s] // *Etnografika Altaya i sopredelnykh territorii: materialy mejdunarodnoi nauchnoi konferentsii* [Ethnography of Altai and Adjacent Territories: Proceedings of the International Scientific Conference]. Is. 8. Barnaul, 2011. Pp. 64–66. (In Russ.).

Safarov, 1985 — *Safarov G.* Kolonialnaya revoliutsiya (opyt Turkestana). [Colonial Revolution (Experience of Turkestan)]. Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatelstvo, 1921. 121 p. (In Russ.).

Shokai, 1993 — *Shokai M.* Turkestan pod vlastyu Sovetov [Turkestan under the rule of Soviets]. Almaty: Ayqap, 1993. 245 p. (In Russ.).

Stalin, 1947 — *Stalin I.V.* Doklad ob ocherednykh zadachah partii i natsionalnom voprose na X syezde RKP(b) 10 marta 1921 g. [Report on the next tasks of the Party and the national question at the 10th Congress of the RCP(b), March 10, 1921.] // *Stalin I.V. Sochineniya*. Moscow. 1947. Vol. 5. Pp. 33–44. (In Russ.).

Sulkevich, 1926 — *Sulkevich I.V.* Administrativno-politicheskoe stroenie Soyuza SSR: (Materialy o territorialnykh preobrazovaniyakh s 1917 po 1 iyulya 1925 g.) [Administrative and Political Structure of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics: (Materials on Territorial Transformations from 1917 to July 1, 1925)]. Leningrad: Gosudarstvennoe izdanie, 1926. 300 p. (In Russ.).

Sultangaliyev, 1995 — *Sultangaliyev M.* Nekotorye nashi soobrajeniy ob osnovakh sotsialno-ekonomicheskogo i kulturnogo razvitiya tiyrkskikh narodov Azii i Evropy [Some of our thoughts on the foundations of the socio-economic and cultural development of the Turkic peoples of Asia and Europe] // *Zhurnal «Gasyrlaravazy. Ehkho vekov»*. Kazan, 1995, May. 130 p. (In Russ.).

Tashenov, 1960 — *Tashenov K.T.* Natsionalno-gosudarstvennoe razmezhevaniye v Srednei Azii i Kazakhstane [National-State Partition in Central Asia and Kazakhstan]. Alma-Ata. 1960. (K. Nurpeysov Foundation). Pp. 24–27. (In Russ.).

Qoigeldiyev, 2004 — *Qoigeldiyev M.* Ulttyq sayasi elita [National political elite]. Almaty: Zhalyyn, 2004. (In Kaz.).

Qozybayev, 1998 — *Qozybayev M.Q.* Gasyr tauqymetin arqalagan arystar [Lions carrying the armor of the century] // Tarih zerdesi. Ekinshi kitap: Arystar tugyry. Almaty: Gylym, 1998. 278 p. (In Kaz.).

Ustinov, 1996 — *Ustinov V.M.* Turar Ryskulov (Ocherki politicheskoi biografii) [Turar Ryskulov (Essays on Political Biography)]. Almaty: Kazakhstan, 1996. 98 p. (In Russ.).

Yakubovskaya, 1972 — *Yakubovskaya S.I.* Razvitie SSSR kak soiynogo gosudarstva. 1922–1936 gg. [Development of the USSR as a Union State. 1922–1936.]. Moscow: Nauka, 1972. Pp. 78–81. (In Russ.).

Литература

Абашин, 2007 — *Абашин С.* Национализмы в Средней Азии. Санкт-Петербург, 2007. С. 183–187.

Агдарбеков, 1990 — *Агдарбеков Т.А.* Основные проблемы национально-государственного строительства в Казахской автономной республике, 1920–1936 гг.: автореф. дис. ... д-ра. юр. наук. Алма-Ата, 1990. 32 с.

Агзамходжаев, 2005 — *Агзамходжаев С.* История туркестанской автономии. Ташкент, 2005. 263 с.

Александров, 1921 — *Александров И.Г.* Экономическое районирование России. Москва, 1921. 15 с.

Бейсембаев, Кульбаев, 1974 — *Бейсембаев С., Кульбаев С.* Турар Рыскулов. Алма-Ата: Издательство Казахстана, 1974. 391 с.

Бенигсен, 1983 — *Бенигсен А.* Мусульмане в СССР. Париж: YMCA-PRESS, 1983. 86 с.

Буттино, 2007 — *Буттино М.* Революция наоборот. Средняя Азия между падением царской империи и образованием СССР. Москва: Звенья, 2007. С. 293–301.

Декларация, 1957 — Декларация прав народов России. Декреты Советской власти. Москва: Государственное издательство политической науки, 1957. Т. 1. С. 35–43.

Дёнингхаус, 2011 — *Дёнингхаус В.* В тени «Большого Брата»: Западные национальные меньшинства в СССР (1917–1938). Москва: Российская политическая энциклопедия, 2011. 727 с.

Исхаков, 2004 — *Исхаков С.М.* Российские мусульмане и революция. Москва: Социально-политическая мысль, 2004. 598 с.

Козыбаев, 1998 — *Қойгелдиев М.Қ.* Ғасыр тауқыметін арқалаған арыстар. Тарих зердесі. Екінші кітап: Арсытар тұғыры. Алматы: Ғылым, 1998. 278 б.

Қойгелдиев, 2004 — *Қойгелдиев М.* Ұлттық саяси элита қызметі мен тағдыры (XVIII–XX ғғ.). Алматы: Жалын, 2004. 397 б.

Малдыбекова, 2002 — *Малдыбекова М.А.* Размежевание Туркестанской Республики и проблемы территориальной целостности Казахской АССР: дис. ... канд. ист. наук. Туркестан, 2002. 146 с.

Мартин, 2011 — *Мартин Т.* Империя «положительной деятельности». Нации и национализм в СССР, 1923–1939. Москва: Фонд «Президентский центр Б.Н. Ельцина» (РОССПЭН), 2011. 662 с.

Назаров, 1965 — *Назаров С.А.* 1965. Из истории деятельности Средазбюро ЦК ВКП(б) (1922–1924 гг.). Ташкент: Узбекистан, 1965. С. 115–119.

Нусупбеков, 1953 — *Нусупбеков А.* Объединение казахских земель в Казахской Советской Социалистической Республике. Алма-Ата: Издательство Академии наук Казахской ССР, 1953. 190 с.

Рыскулов, 1997 — *Рыскулов Т.* Собрание сочинений в 3-х томах, Том 2. Алматы: Казахстан, 1997. С. 33–197.

Садыков, 2011 — *Садыков Е.Б.* Государственно-территориальное размежевание Казахстана и Сибиря в контексте национальной политики 1920-х годов // Этнография Алтая и сопредельных территорий: материалы международной научной конференции. Вып. 8. Барнаул, 2011. С. 64–66.

Сафаров, 1985 — *Сафаров Г.* Колониальная революция (опыт Туркестана). Reprint: Oxford, 1985. 121 с.

Сталин, 1947 — *Сталин И.В.* Доклад об очередных задачах партии и национальном вопросе на X съезде РКП(б) 10 марта 1921 г. // Сталин И.В. Сочинения. М., 1947. Т. 5. С. 33–44.

Султангалиев, 1995 — *Султангалиев М.* Некоторые наши соображения об основах социально-экономического и культурного развития тюркских народов Азии и Европы // Журнал «Ғасырлар аязы. Эхо веков». Казань, 1995. 130 с.

Сулькевич, 1926 — *Сулькевич С.И.* Административно-политическое строение Союза ССР: (материалы о территориальных преобразованиях с 1917 г. по 1 июля 1925 г.). Ленинград: Государственное издательство, 1926. 300 с.

- Ташенов, 1960 — *Ташенов К.Т.* Национально-государственное размежевание в Средней Азии и Казахстане. Алма-Ата: б.и. 1960. С. 24–27.
- Устинов, 1996 — *Устинов В.М.* Турар Рыскулов (Очерки политической биографии). Алматы: Казахстан, 1996. 98 с.
- Халид, 2010 — *Халид А.* Ислам после коммунизма: Религия и политика в Центральной Азии. Москва: Новое литературное обозрение, 2010. 304 с.
- Ходжаев, 1932 — *Ходжаев Ф.* К истории революции в Бухаре и национального размежевания Средней Азии. Ташкент: Государственное издательство УаССР, 1932. 190 с.
- Шокай, 1993 — *Шокай М.* Туркестан под властью советов. Алматы: Айкап, 1993. 245 с.
- Якубовская, 1972 — *Якубовская С.И.* Развитие СССР как союзного государства. 1922–1936 гг. Москва: Наука, 1972. С. 78–81.
- Caroe, 1953 — *Caroe Olaf.* Soviet Colonialism in Central Asia // Council on Foreign Relations. Vol. 32. No. 1. Pp. 135–144. URL: <https://doi.org/10.2307/20031013> (дата посещения: 01.12.2023).
- Hayit, 1975 — *Hayit Baymirza.* Türkistan Rusya ve Çin Arasında. Alamancadan çeviren Abdülkadir Sadak [Turkestan Between Russia and China. Translated from German by Abdulkadir Sadak]. İstanbul: OtağYayınevi, 1975. 437 p. (In Turk.).
- Hayit, 2004 — *Hayit Baymirza.* Türkistan Devletlerinin Milli Mücadele Tarihi [History of National Struggle of Turkestan States]. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 2004. 448 p. (In Turk.).
- Laruelle, Grek, Davydov, 2023 — *Laruelle Marlene, Grek Ivan, Davydov Sergey.* Culturalizing the Nation: A Quantitative Approach to the Russkii/Rossiiskii Semantic Space in Russia's Political Discourse // Demokratizatsiya: The Journal of Post-Soviet Democratization, Institute for European, Russian, and Eurasian Studies, The George Washington University, 2023. Vol. 31. No. 1. Pp. 3–27.

МАЗМҰНЫ

ТЕОРИЯ ЖӘНЕ ӘДІСНАМА

| | |
|---|----|
| Ахметова Ж., Эгамбердиев М., Әбікей А. | |
| ТҮРКІСТАННЫҢ ҰЛТТЫҚ-ТЕРРИТОРИЯЛЫҚ ТҮРҒЫДАН МЕЖЕЛЕНУ ТАРИХЫНАН..... | 7 |
| Сәтбай Т.Я., Жолдасұлы Т. | |
| ҚАЗАҚСТАН КИНЕМАТОГРАФИСТЕР ОДАҒЫНЫҢ СОҒЫСТАН KEЙІНГІ ЖЫЛДАРДАҒЫ ҚЫЗМЕТІ (1946–1970)..... | 24 |

ТАРИХ

| | |
|--|-----|
| Әбдікұлова Г., Төлєнова З. | |
| КҮНДЕЛІКТІ ӨМІР ТАРИХЫНЫҢ КӨЗДЕРІ: ҚАЗАҚСТАНДЫҚ ЗЕРТТЕУ ТӘЖІРИБЕСІ..... | 37 |
| Бейсембаева А.Р. | |
| XVII ҒАСЫРДЫҢ СОҢЫ – XVIII ҒАСЫРДЫҢ ОРТАСЫНДАҒЫ ҚАЗАҚ-ЖОҢҒАР ҚАТЫНАСТАРДЫҢ KEЙБІР АСПЕКТІЛЕРІ: АРХИВ МАТЕРИАЛДАРЫ НЕГІЗІНДЕ..... | 52 |
| Беркінбаев О.У. | |
| АБЫЛАЙ ЖӘНЕ ОНЫҢ XVIII ҒАСЫРДЫҢ ОРТАСЫНДА МАНЬЧЖУР ӘУЛЕТІМЕН ҚАРЫМ-ҚАТЫНАСЫ...67 | |
| Жұматай С. | |
| ӘБІЛМӘМБЕТ ПЕН АБЫЛАЙДЫҢ РЕСЕЙ ПРОТЕКТОРАТЫН ҚАБЫЛДАУ ПРИНЦИПТЕРІ МЕН БАРЫСЫ (1740 Ж.) ЖӘНЕ ОНЫҢ САЛДАРЫ..... | 83 |
| Қабылдинов З.Е. | |
| СҰЛТАН СҰЛТАНМАМЕТТИҢ ӨМІРІ МЕН ҚЫЗМЕТІНІҢ KEЙБІР АСПЕКТІЛЕРІ (XVIII ҒАСЫРДЫҢ 30–50 ЖЫЛДАРЫ)..... | 94 |
| Қали А.Б. | |
| XIX ҒАСЫРДЫҢ ЕКІНШІ ЖАРТЫСЫНДА ЖЕТІСУ ЖЕРІНЕ ТАТАРЛАРДЫҢ ҚОНЫСТАНУ ТАРИХЫНАН..... | 111 |
| Қуанбай О. | |
| АБЫЛАЙ СҰЛТАННЫҢ ШЕКАРАЛЫҚ АЙМАҚТАҒЫ ДИПЛОМАТИЯЛЫҚ САЯСАТЫ (XVIII ҒАСЫРДЫҢ 30–40 жж.)..... | 124 |
| Қоңырова А.М. | |
| РЕСЕЙ ИМПЕРИЯСЫНЫҢ БІЛІМ БЕРУ САЛАСЫНДАҒЫ ОРЫСТАНДЫРУ САЯСАТЫ (XX ҒАСЫРДЫҢ БАСЫ)..... | 142 |
| Рахимова Қ.Д., Батырхан Б.Ш. | |
| МҰХАММЕД ӘЛИ ФОРУГИДІҢ ИРАНДА ЖАҢА ИНТЕЛЛЕКТУАЛДЫ ОРТА ҚАЛЫПТАСТЫРУДАҒЫ РӨЛІ..... | 154 |
| Рысқұлов Т.А. | |
| ОРТА ЖҮЗ ҚАЗАҚТАРЫ МЕН РЕСЕЙ АРАСЫНДАҒЫ САУДА ҚАТЫНАСТАРЫНЫҢ ОРНАУЫ МЕН ДАМУЫНДАҒЫ АБЫЛАЙ ХАННЫҢ РӨЛІ (1730–1750 ЖЖ)..... | 169 |
| Тоқболат С.Т., Жүрсінбаев Б.А., Жұбанышов Б.Т. | |
| ДАЛА ЖОРЫҒЫ: 1839 ЖЫЛҒЫ РЕСЕЙ ИМПЕРИЯСЫНЫҢ ХИУА ЖОРЫҒЫНДАҒЫ КІШІ ЖҮЗ ҚАЗАҚТАРЫНЫҢ РӨЛІ..... | 184 |
| Торайғыров Е.М. | |
| ҚАЗАҚ-ЖОҢҒАР ДИПЛОМАТИЯЛЫҚ, ӘУЛЕТТІК ЖӘНЕ САУДА ҚАТЫНАСТАРЫ..... | 202 |
| Мұхатова О.Х., Доскараева А.А., Сисенбаева А.А. | |
| ОТЫНШЫ ӘЛЖАНОВТЫҢ АҒАРТУШЫЛЫҚ ҚЫЗМЕТІ ЖӘНЕ КӨЗҚАРАСТАРЫ..... | 218 |
| Ноури М., Жеңіс Ж., Ализәде | |
| XX ҒАСЫРДЫҢ 30-ЖЫЛДАРЫНДА ҚАЗАҚТАРДЫҢ МАҢҒЫСТАУ ОБЛЫСЫНАН ИРАНҒА РЕЗА ШАХТАН БАСТАП БҮГІНГІ КҮНГЕ ДЕЙІН ҚОНЫС АУДАРУЫ..... | 234 |

АНТРОПОЛОГИЯ

| | |
|--|-----|
| Досымбетов Н.А. | |
| ФОЛЬКЛОРЛЫҚ ДЕРЕКТЕРДЕГІ ҚАЗАҚТАРДЫҢ ЕГІНШІЛІК МӘДЕНИЕТІ (ЭТНОГРАФИЯЛЫҚ ЗЕРТТЕУЛЕР НӘТИЖЕСІМЕН)..... | 247 |
| Сейтхан Ш. | |
| МОҢҒОЛДАРДЫҢ ЖЫЛҚЫҒА ҚОЛДАНАТЫН ТАҢБАЛАРЫ ЖӘНЕ ТАҢБАЛАУ ДӘСТҮРЛЕРІ..... | 261 |

СОДЕРЖАНИЕ

ТЕОРИЯ И МЕТОДОЛОГИИ

| | |
|--|----|
| Ахметова Ж., Эгамбердиев М., Абикей А. ИЗ ИСТОРИИ НАЦИОНАЛЬНО-ТЕРРИТОРИАЛЬНОГО РАЗМЕЖЕВАНИЯ ТУРКЕСТАНА..... | 7 |
| Сатбай Т.Я., Жолдасұлы Т. ДЕЯТЕЛЬНОСТЬ СОЮЗА КИНЕМАТОГРАФИСТОВ КАЗАХСТАНА В ПОСЛЕВОЕННЫЕ ГОДЫ (1946–1970)..... | 24 |

ИСТОРИЯ

| | |
|--|-----|
| Абдыкулова Г., Толенова З. МНОГОМЕРНЫЕ ИСТОЧНИКИ ИСТОРИИ ПОВСЕДНЕВНОСТИ: ОПЫТ КАЗАХСТАНСКИХ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЙ..... | 37 |
| Бейсембаева А.Р. НЕКОТОРЫЕ АСПЕКТЫ КАЗАХСКО-ДЖУНГАРСКИХ ОТНОШЕНИЙ В КОНЦЕ XVII – СЕРЕДИНЕ XVIII ВЕКОВ: НА ОСНОВЕ АРХИВНЫХ МАТЕРИАЛОВ..... | 52 |
| Беркинбаев О.У. АБЫЛАЙ И ЕГО ВЗАИМООТНОШЕНИЯ С МАНЬЧЖУРСКОЙ ДИНАСТИЕЙ В СЕРЕДИНЕ XVIII ВЕКА..... | 67 |
| Жуматай С. ПРИНЦИПЫ И ХОД ПРИНЯТИЯ РОССИЙСКОГО ПРОТЕКТОРАТА АБУЛМАМБЕТОМ И АБЫЛАЕМ (1740 г.) И ЕГО ПОСЛЕДСТВИЯ..... | 83 |
| Кабульдинов З.Е. НЕКОТОРЫЕ АСПЕКТЫ ИЗ ЖИЗНИ И ДЕЯТЕЛЬНОСТИ СУЛТАНА СУЛТАНМАМЕТА (30–50 ГОДЫ XVIII ВЕКА)..... | 94 |
| Кали А.Б. ИЗ ИСТОРИИ ЗАСЕЛЕНИЯ ТАТАР СЕМИРЕЧЬЯ ВО ВТОРОЙ ПОЛОВИНЕ XIX ВЕКА..... | 111 |
| Куанбай О. ДИПЛОМАТИЧЕСКАЯ ПОЛИТИКА СУЛТАНА АБЛАЯ В ПРИГРАНИЧНОЙ ЗОНЕ (30–40-е годы XVIII ВЕКА)..... | 124 |
| Коньрова А.М. ПОЛИТИКА РУСИФИКАЦИИ РОССИЙСКОЙ ИМПЕРИИ В СФЕРЕ ОБРАЗОВАНИЯ (НАЧАЛО XX ВЕКА).... | 142 |
| Рахимова К.Д., Батырхан Б.Ш. РОЛЬ МУХАММЕДА АЛИ ФОРУГИ В ФОРМИРОВАНИИ НОВОЙ ИНТЕЛЛЕКТУАЛЬНОЙ СРЕДЫ В ИРАНЕ..... | 154 |
| Токболат С.Т., Джурсунбаев Б.А., Жубанышов Б.Т. РОЛЬ АБЫЛАЯ В УСТАНОВЛЕНИИ И РАЗВИТИИ ТОРГОВЫХ ОТНОШЕНИЙ КАЗАХОВ СРЕДНЕГО ЖУЗА С РОССИЕЙ В 1730–1750-Х ГГ..... | 169 |
| Токболат С.Т., Джурсунбаев Б.А., Жубанышов Б.Т. ПОХОД ПО СТЕПИ: РОЛЬ КАЗАХОВ МЛАДШЕГО ЖУЗА В ХИВИНСКОМ ПОХОДЕ РОССИЙСКОЙ ИМПЕРИИ 1839 ГОДА..... | 184 |
| Торайгыров Е.М. КАЗАХСКО-ДЖУНГАРСКИЕ ДИПЛОМАТИЧЕСКИЕ, ДИНАСТИЙНЫЕ И ТОРГОВЫЕ ОТНОШЕНИЯ..... | 202 |
| Мухатова О.Х., Доскараева А.А., Сисенбаева А.А. ПРОСВЕТИТЕЛЬСКАЯ ДЕЯТЕЛЬНОСТЬ И ВЗГЛЯДЫ ОТЫНШЫ АЛЖАНОВА..... | 218 |
| Ноури М., Жеңіс Ж., Ализиде ИРАНСКИЕ КАЗАХИ-ПЕРЕСЕЛЕНЦЫ 1930-Х ГОДОВ С МАНГЫСТАУ: СО ВРЕМЕН РЕЗА ШАХА ДО НАШИХ ДНЕЙ..... | 234 |

АНТРОПОЛОГИЯ

| | |
|--|-----|
| Досымбетов Н.А. КУЛЬТУРА ЗЕМЛЕДЕЛИЯ КАЗАХОВ В ФОЛЬКЛОРНЫХ ИСТОЧНИКАХ (ОПЫТ ЭТНОГРАФИЧЕСКОГО ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ)..... | 247 |
| Сейтхан Ш. МОНГОЛЬСКИЕ КЛЕЙМА ДЛЯ ЛОЩАДЕЙ И ТРАДИЦИИ ДЕЛАТЬ КЛЕЙМА..... | 261 |

CONTENTS

THEORY OF METHODOLOGY

| | |
|--|----|
| Akhmetova Zh., Egamberdiyev M., Abikey A. FROM THE HISTORY OF NATIONAL-TERRITORIAL DEMARCATION OF TURKESTAN..... | 7 |
| Satbay T., Zholdassuly T. THE ACTIVITIES OF THE UNION OF CINEMATOGRAPHERS OF KAZAKHSTAN IN THE POSTWAR YEARS (1946–1970)..... | 24 |

HISTORY

| | |
|--|-----|
| Abdykulova G., Tolenova Z. MULTIFACETED SOURCES OF EVERYDAY HISTORY: THE EXPERIENCE OF KAZAKHSTANI RESEARCH..... | 37 |
| Beisembayeva A.R. CERTAIN ASPECTS OF THE KAZAKH-DZUNGAR RELATIONS IN THE LATE XVII – MIDDLE XVIII CENTURIES: BASED ON ARCHIVAL SOURCES..... | 52 |
| Berkinbayev O.U. ABYLAI AND HIS RELATIONSHIP WITH THE MANCHU DYNASTY IN THE MIDDLE OF THE XVIII CENTURY..... | 67 |
| Zhumatay S. PRINCIPLES AND COURSE OF THE ADOPTION OF THE RUSSIAN PROTECTORATE BY ABULMAMBET AND ABYLAI (1740) AND ITS CONSEQUENCES..... | 83 |
| Kabuldinov Z.E. SOME ASPECTS OF THE LIFE AND WORK OF SULTAN SULTANMAMET (1730s–1750s)..... | 94 |
| Kali A.B. FROM THE HISTORY OF THE TATAR SETTLEMENT TO ZHETYSU IN THE SECOND HALF OF THE XIX CENTURY..... | 111 |
| Kuanbay O. DIPLOMATIC POLICY OF SULTAN ABLAI IN THE BORDER AREA (1730s–1740s)..... | 124 |
| Konyrova A. RUSSIFICATION POLICY OF THE RUSSIAN EMPIRE IN THE FIELD OF EDUCATION (EARLY 20th CENTURY)..... | 142 |
| Rakhimova K., Batyrkhan B. THE ROLE OF MUHAMMAD ALI FOROUGI IN THE FORMATION OF A NEW INTELLECTUAL ENVIRONMENT IN IRAN..... | 154 |
| Ryskulov T. THE ROLE OF ABYLAI IN THE ESTABLISHMENT AND DEVELOPMENT OF TRADE RELATIONS BETWEEN THE KAZAKHS OF THE MIDDLE ZHUZ AND RUSSIA IN THE 1730S–1750S..... | 169 |
| Tokbolat S., Dzhursunbayev, Zhubanyshov B. CAMPAIGNING ACROSS THE STEPPE: THE VITAL ROLE OF THE JUNIOR ZHUZ KAZAKHS IN IMPERIAL RUSSIA'S 1839 KHIVA CAMPAIGN..... | 184 |
| Toraigyrov Y.M. KAZAKH-JUNGAR DIPLOMATIC, DYNASTY AND TRADE RELATIONS..... | 202 |
| Mukhatova O. Kh., Doskarayeva A.A., Sisenbayeva A.A. EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES AND VIEWS OF OTYNSHY ALZHANOV..... | 218 |
| Nouri M., Zhengis Zh., Alizade THE RESETTLEMENT OF KAZAKHS FROM THE MANGISTAU REGION TO IRAN IN THE 1930-s FROM THE TIME OF REZA SHAH TO THE PRESENT DAY..... | 234 |

ANTHROPOLOGY

| | |
|---|-----|
| Dossymbetov N.A. AGRICULTURAL CULTURE OF KAZAKHS IN FOLKLORE DATA (EXPERIENCE OF ETHNOGRAPHIC RESEARCH)..... | 247 |
| Syeitkhan Sh. TYPES OF BRANDS (TAMGA) USED BY MONGOLIANS ON HORSES AND THE BRANDING TRADITIONS..... | 261 |

EDU.E-HISTORY.KZ

электрондық ғылыми

журналы 2024. 11 (1)

Бас редактор:
Қабылдинов З.Е.

Компьютерде беттеген:
Копеева С.Ж.

Жарияланған күні: 25.03.2024.
Пішімі 70x100/16. Баспа табағы 21,125.

Құрылтайшысы және баспагері:
Қазақстан Республикасы Ғылым және жоғары білім министрлігі Ғылым
комитеті Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институты
ШЖҚ РМҚ

Редакция мен баспаның мекен-жайы:
050010, Қазақстан Республикасы, Алматы қ., Шевченко көш., 28-үй
ҚР ҒЖБМ ҒК Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институты ШЖҚ
РМҚ Тел.: +7 (727) 261-67-19, +7 (727) 272-47-59

Е-mail: edu.history@bk.ru
Журнал сайты: <https://edu.e-history.kz>

Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов ат. ТжЭИ басылған:
050010 Қазақстан Республикасы, Алматы қ., Шевченко көш., 28-үй